

REMARKS

A substitute specification is required. A substitute specification according to 37 §C.F.R. 1.125(a) is submitted herewith in clean form (Attachment A).

Claims 3, 5-20, 23 and 34 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 21, 22 and 24-33 and 35-39 remain pending in the application.

The Examiner indicates that claims 1, 2, 4, 21, 22, 24-33, 35-37 and 39 are allowed.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Strong U.S. 4,286,002 (Strong '002) in view of Jackson U.S. 4,280,487 (Jackson '487). Claim 38 has been amended to overcome this rejection. As defined by the amended claim 38, neither of the cited references teach or suggest a flexible laminated sheet material in which a substantially air-impermeable second layer adapted to contact the body of a person. Strong '002 discloses a urine collection pad in which an air-impermeable layer 14 having a set of outlet air perforations 22 is located between resilient layer 12 and absorbent layer 20, such that the perforated air-impermeable layer does not contact the patient's body. When full of urine, the pad is disposed of (see col. 2, lines 22 and 23). This is because to make liquid evaporate requires a substantial input of energy, e.g., fast flow of hot air. This use of energy would not be practical or desirable in association with a single-use disposable pad, which can be readily and economically replaced. Use of energy to evaporate moisture from such a pad would be inefficient in both time and cost. The device of Strong '002 is also not suitable to evaporate liquid for several reasons. First, the patient would have to be lifted off the pad. Hot air would then have to be directed through the pad to evaporate the liquid. It would not only be ineffective, but unpleasant and unhygienic. Jackson '487 similarly discloses a pad in which an air permeable sheet 30 is in contact with the patient. The air permeable sheet 30 rests on a pad 11 having an upper panel 11a having perforations 28 and a lower panel 11b. This is the reverse of the claimed subject matter, in which the substantially air-impermeable layer contacts the body of the patient. Therefore, Jackson '487 teaches away from the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, it would not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter, even in combination with Strong '002. Furthermore, as previously noted, the circulation of air to evaporate liquid in the device of Strong '002 would be undesirable. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to use the air circulation taught by Jackson '487 in the device of Strong '002.

Application Serial No. 09/701,948

Amendment C

Page - 7 -

Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 21, 22 and 24-33 and 35-39 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

By Patricia A. Limbach
Patricia A. Limbach
Registration No. 50,295

RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.

Post Office Box 26618

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53226

(262) 783 - 1300

30 March 2004

Customer No.: 26308

LAURENCE SHAW/9493.17215/040310 AMENDMENT C

Enclosures: Amendment Transmittal Letter
 Attachment A
 Return Postcard